

HUGHES, CHARLES E.

MANUSCRIPTS

SPEECHES

71 2009 085. 05 728

Speeches Honoring Abraham Lincoln

Charles E. Hughes

From the files of the
Lincoln Financial Foundation Collection
(formerly referenced as Manuscript Files)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

FOR THE PRESS:

April 14, 1924.

CONFIDENTIAL RELEASE FOR PUBLICATION, UPON DELIVERY, AND NOT TO BE PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED, QUOTED FROM OR USED IN ANY WAY.

ADDRESS OF CHARLES E. HUGHES, SECRETARY OF STATE, AS TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF THE NEW YORK REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION, HELD AT THE TOWN HALL, NEW YORK CITY, ON THE EVENING OF TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1924.

Mr. Hughes said:

We approach the Presidential campaign with the confidence which welcomes a candid appraisal of achievement. That appraisal will be had. They reckon ill who think that it can be evaded by general denunciation. We are fortunate in our leader. The country has no misgiving as it places its trust in the firm and skillful guidance of President Coolidge.

Let it be understood that we do not condone wrong; we extenuate no crime. We would not put any obstacle in the way of discovery and punishment of any official dereliction. We would bring to the bar of justice every dishonest official and every perverter of administration in or out of office. This is a duty which can be, and will be, competently discharged by the appropriate agencies without any sacrifice of constitutional procedure.

Neither political party has a monopoly of virtue or of rascality. There are crooks in every community and in every party. Now and then, one gets into office. Let wrongs be exposed and punished, but let not partisan Pecksniffs affect "a holier than thou" attitude. The corrupting currency may be found in Democratic satchels. One who is corrupt is as faithless to his party as to his government. Guilt is personal and corruption knows no party.

Today, counsel of eminent ability and unimpeachable integrity, selected from both the great parties by a Republican President, are taking

taking appropriate legal proceedings by which all the questions which have been raised as to the leasing of the public domain will be threshed out, every public interest will be safeguarded and every guilty person punished. These cases are in the courts where they belong, and the courts will decide. It would be foolish, false and unpatriotic to breed distrust either of the integrity of the Government or of the soundness of American life. That would be to assail the honor of the hosts of officials devoting their lives with unselfish fidelity to the country's interests. President Coolidge has said: "For us, we propose to follow the clear, open path of justice. There will be immediate, adequate, unshrinking prosecution, criminal and civil, to punish the guilty and to protect every national interest. In this effort there will be no politics and no partisanship. It will be speedy; it will be just. I am a Republican, but I cannot on that account shield anyone because he is a Republican. I am a Republican, but I cannot on that account prosecute anyone because he is a Democrat." That is a fair, high-minded, unequivocal statement. That is the Republican position.

While the American people detest crookedness and corruption, they are not fond of scandal-mongers. In every part of the land, in the more than twenty-five hundred counties of our States, our people are sitting as grand jurors and petty jurors pursuant to our time-honored traditions, sifting evidence, finding and refusing indictments, trying the facts, convicting and acquitting, stigmatizing wrongdoing and protecting innocence, thus vindicating the methods of judicial procedure and fair trial which have been established for generations both to protect the public and to safeguard the sacred right of individuals to be secure in person and reputation against unfounded accusations. Throughout this favored country, in countless jury rooms our people are dealing directly with the credibility of witnesses, with the exhibition of the grudges and personal animosities of talebearers,

and

and they know the difference between evidence and hearsay, between proof and malicious reports, between scurrilous innuendoes and sustained charges. They do not wish the guilty to escape but they know that there is no security for life or liberty or character if the standards of justice are ignored and guilt is assumed before it is established. The injunction of Jehovah to the great law-giver of Israel is still pertinent: "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment; thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honour the person of the mighty: but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor. Thou shalt not go up and down as a talebearer among thy people."

The workers of this country are entitled to an administration of government which safeguards the opportunities of industry, which lives within its income, which reduces governmental expenditures and thus makes possible relief from oppressive taxation, which practices national thrift, the key to national prosperity. Four years ago, the Republican Party promised this, and it has kept its promise. We point not to professions but to actual, extraordinary achievement. Every business man, every wage earner has a stake in the continuance of this sort of administration.

Recall the conditions when the Republican Party came into power. The crisis of the year 1921 has been described by the most competent authority as one of the most serious this country has ever experienced. The war had wrought economic dislocation and induced a profligacy in expenditure. Throughout the world there was instability and grave apprehension. We were in a state of unrest and were suffering from the strain of excessive excitement. Our activities needed adjustment; some had been overstimulated, others had been depressed. Capital was timid, a plight rested upon industry, nearly five millions of our workers were out of employment. Instead of prosperity we were facing disaster if relief could not be had. If the Republican Administration had not grappled with these difficulties there would have been just ground
for

for complaint. That it was able to deal with them and to marshal all the assistance that government could render to surmount them is ground for congratulation and confidence. The Administration at once addressed itself to the problem. No means of securing the widest cooperation of our people, in every department of activity, was neglected. Every effort was made to foster industry and trade. The Administration wasted no time on claptrap or quack remedies. Aided by sound economic policies and the skillful management of the finances of the government, business recovered and labor was fully employed.

It was necessary to revise the tariff. In years gone by, we have debated the principle of a protective tariff. There is no longer need to debate that principle. The contest now is over the application of the principle to which the Republican Party has consistently adhered. In the case of any tariff, the inescapable test is in practice and our experience under the last tariff has effectively disposed of certain objections strongly urged. Thus, it was insisted that the new tariff would injuriously affect our foreign trade. It was asserted that the increase in duties would limit our imports and thus impair our ability to export. But consider the actual consequences. I am advised by the Department of Commerce that comparing the 17 months preceding the enactment of the new tariff (May 1921 to September 1922, inclusive) with the succeeding 17 months (October 1922 to February 1924, inclusive) our imports increased from \$3,761,322,000 to \$5,353,186,000 or 42 per cent. Our exports for the same period increased from \$5,353,893,000 to \$6,025,162,000, or 12 per cent. The duties collected in the two periods above-mentioned increased from \$521,000,000 to \$807,000,000. It is interesting to note the increased imports from Canada, Latin America and Asia, indicating the extent to which we are going directly to the source of production for our raw materials instead of getting them partly manufactured from Europe. For example, with respect to the East,

comparing

comparing the two calendar years, 1922 and 1923, I am advised that our imports from China increased from \$135,000,000 to \$187,000,000; from India from \$91,000,000 to \$128,000,000; from the Strait Settlements from \$94,000,000 to \$154,000,000; and from the Dutch East Indies from \$34,000,000 to \$55,000,000. To some extent, the increases in values represent the upward tendency in prices, but undoubtedly the most important factors are our enlarged demand for raw materials and their direct importation. On the other hand, the increase in our export trade seems to show that our greater purchases from Canada, Latin America and Asia have developed the purchasing power of these regions and an increased demand for American products.

The Republican Administration has established an effective budget control. The highways of politics are strewn with broken promises of economy in government. This time the pledge has been redeemed. The people of the United States wish their taxes reduced, and a broad scientific plan of tax reduction would already have been in operation if it had not been for the opposition to the sound proposals of the Administration. But reduction in taxation would not be possible were it not for retrenchment in governmental expenditures. To this most difficult of all tasks, the Administration set itself determinedly. Not only was provision made by law for a budget system, but President Harding took the words of the statute and made them a living force by a supremely efficient organization. He demanded of his Department chiefs the most rigid economy. He evoked a new spirit of efficiency. He not only required that requests for appropriations should stand the minutest inquiry, but after reduced appropriations were granted he insisted upon spending less than the amounts appropriated. He did not propose to diminish governmental activities required by law or demanded by the public need, but as he said, "there was first the commitment to efficiency and then commendable strife for economy." He dissipated the notion that government departments must expend all their appropriations

and

and that no available cash should go back to the Treasury. In the forwarding of this great reform President Harding supplied the driving force and this alone entitles him to lasting honor.

What was the result? The reduction in governmental expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922 as compared with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921 was about \$1,700,000,000. There was a surplus of about \$300,000,000. The current expenses for the year were about \$600,000,000 less than the departmental estimates. These economies are being maintained and further restrictions in expenditures are being effected.

In connection with this economizing, there has been a brilliant management of the government finances by the Secretary of the Treasury. When the Republican Administration came into power the public debt amounted to about \$24,000,000,000, or about ten times what it was at the close of the Civil War and about twenty times the public debt at the end of the Spanish War. Of this debt approximately \$7,500,000,000 was short-dated debt maturing within two and one-half years. The larger part of this debt had to be refunded, but to accomplish the refunding in time of peace of such an enormous amount was a stupendous task. It was accomplished, however, without any disturbance to business. In addition to the refunding operations, the Administration made substantial reductions in the public debt. It has adopted the policy of including in its ordinary budget, certain fixed debt charges including the sinking funds. In addition to these retirements the surplus receipts are applied to debt reductions. The result is that by March 1, 1924 there had been effected a reduction in the public debt of about \$2,260,000,000.

It was this rigid economy in governmental expenditures and this wise fiscal management which made it possible for the Secretary of the Treasury to propose a thorough-going scientific plan of tax reduction which has met countrywide approval. He proposed a reduction which would carry benefits to all the workers in the country. It would have effected a readjustment, not only

fair

fair in itself as a relief from excessive war taxation, but so arranged as to produce larger revenues while at the same time inviting capital to embark more freely in productive enterprise and thus stimulate our trade and commerce. There is no doubt that the opposition to this plan and the delay in providing this needed relief is responsible for holding back a movement which it is believed would have already given to the country an increased prosperity. Certainly, the responsibility for delay must rest with those who oppose the plan and not upon those who proposed it. The Republican Administration prepared the plan of tax reduction; the Republican President has urged it. The program of national economy, of debt liquidation, of well balanced tax reduction is the Republican policy. It is a policy which in large part has passed beyond the promises of party platforms into a record of distinguished performance. Our people know that if the Republican Administration is supported at the coming election this sound program of competent and efficient national housekeeping will be continued. Our economic ills in whatever part of the country they may be found cannot be cured if we permit extravagance and waste. We cannot have progress and prosperity without national thrift.

Another gratifying accomplishment is the funding of the British debt of \$4,600,000,000 on terms fair to both nations. The American people have been opposed to the cancellation of the debts owing to us by European nations and incurred during and after the war, believing that these were obligations of honor and that the necessary basis of international credit must be found in the recognition of the sanctity of international engagements. But we have no desire to be harsh or oppressive in the terms of settlement. The British adjustment is in the highest degree creditable to the British Government, constituting a most important contribution to stability and renewed confidence. A similar adjustment has been made of the debt of Finland and other

refunding

refunding negotiations are in progress.

When the Republican Administration came into power we were still in a technical state of war. In the Far East our relations were embarrassed by suspicion and distrust, giving rise to grave apprehensions. In this hemisphere old scores were still festering. For these reasons our foreign relations were far from satisfactory. The situation was a most difficult one as the opportunities for dispute lay on every hand while the chances of finding adequate means of accommodation were extremely meager.

It is not intended to revive an old dispute, but it is believed that dispassionate history will record the serious mistake of making a permanent plan for international organization, or for a society of nations, a part of a treaty embodying the terms of peace laid down by the victors in the Great War, and of introducing into that plan political commitments which were opposed to the genius of our institutions. It soon became apparent that the United States would not participate in such a plan without adequate reservations. Even then the opportunities for compromise were rejected by the former Administration and the treaty failed of approval. When President Harding took office it was manifest that it would be worse than futile to reopen that debate, on any pretext or proposal, and he followed the only course in which there was promise of achievement, and this promise was abundantly realized.

The technical state of war was speedily ended. Treaties with enemy Powers, safeguarding our own rights without derogating from the rights of our former associates in the War, were concluded and approved by the Senate. In addition a claims agreement was made with Germany and a unique tribute was paid to the American sense of justice by placing the deciding vote in the hands of one of our own citizens.

The American people cherish their independence. They were
unwilling

unwilling to enter into ambiguous commitments which in one breath were sought to be explained away as having little significance and in another were strenuously demanded as being of vital importance. They refused to assume by any form of words an obligation to take part in the neverending conflicts of rival ambitions in Europe, but nonetheless they earnestly desire peace and seek in every way consistent with their traditions to promote it. President Harding incarnated this desire and purpose. The exigency and opportunity lay at hand, and perhaps there has never been a more important contribution to the cause of peace than that which was made under the auspices of this Government through the Washington Conference. I have observed here and there the effort to depreciate the work of the Conference, but such an endeavor will not prosper in the face of world knowledge and appreciation, and merely serves to betray a narrow vision or a partisan extremity. The Conference was limited to a few nations and in its aims; out for that very reason it succeeded. The Powers possessing great navies met to discuss the limitation of armament. They, with four other Powers especially interested, considered Far Eastern and Pacific questions. For the first time, a limitation of the naval strength of the great Powers was agreed upon. By common consent the best measure of that strength was found in the capital battleships of the rival navies. The agreement put an end to the competitive programs in these ships, saving to tax-burdened peoples, including our own, hundreds of millions of dollars. The agreement was fair to all, as is abundantly shown by the complaints of the dissatisfied in each country. The United States had the privilege of leadership and it made its sacrifices, but these were proportionate and were relatively fair. There are two sorts of critics who constitute the chief obstacles to progress whatever labels they may wear. They are those who want nothing done and those who are only content with the impossible.

The

The most important result of the Washington Conference was the establishment of a new understanding in the Far East. The darkening clouds were dispelled. Distrust yielded to mutual confidence. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance was brought to an end, and provision for the future was made by an agreement which did no violence to American tradition but in its very simplicity and adaptability contained the highest promise of continued accord. Peace in the Pacific, so far as this generation can see ahead, is undoubtedly assured. The American policy of the "Open Door" was taken out of diplomatic notes and made the subject of a formal treaty with more explicit terms than that in which it had ever been expressed. When the treaties relating to China go into effect, and we trust that will be in the near future, there will be afforded practical methods of helpfulness in the very difficult situation that is now presented. Our policies in the Far East have been defined and a sound basis of cooperation has been laid. It should be added that these treaties disposed of the ambiguous Lansing-Ishii agreement which was subsequently formally cancelled.

The Washington Conference established a precedent of controlling importance. It is safe to say that all who may in the future labor for further limitations of armament will emulate the example and evoke the happy spirit of cooperation which animated that Conference. While the greater part of the proposals of this Government were adopted, there were other portions which could not be progressed. This unfinished business will be taken up as soon as there appears to be a reasonable prospect of success. As President Harding said, we want "less of armament and none of war."

There is sound reason for gratification in the increasing goodwill and mutual helpfulness which have characterized during the last few years the development of the relations between the United States and her sister republics of the American continent. This hemisphere should be the exemplar of peace and friendly cooperation.

cooperation. Whatever contribution we can make elsewhere to the progress of civilization, here is our first duty and immediate opportunity to present an example of unity of ideals and unity of purpose, of a common determination to settle all differences by the orderly processes of conference, mediation and arbitration. You may recall that it was just three years ago, at the unveiling of the statue of Bolivar in this city, that President Harding set forth the attitude and aims of the Administration with respect to our relations with Latin America. And there has been no deviation from the principles he then declared. The record of these years has been an inspiring one, not only because of the definite results achieved but mainly by reason of the new spirit of confidence and friendliness which pervades our inter-American relations.

The Administration has enjoyed the privilege of having advanced towards settlement a question which for forty years has disturbed the relations between two of our sister republics, Chile and Peru. This controversy has hung like a cloud over the international relations of Latin America and it is a great satisfaction to be able to announce that the proceedings are now being concluded for its final submission to the arbitration of the President of the United States. The troublesome difficulties which for many years have disturbed our relations with Mexico have yielded to a friendly adjustment. We have been able to resume our normal intercourse and two conventions have been entered into for the arbitral determination of claims. More important than any formal arrangements of this sort is the better understanding and friendly accord which have been reached, holding promise for the first time in many years of a mutually beneficial cooperation upon a sound basis. I am glad to be able to add that the efforts to secure an independent and stable government in Santo Domingo, so as to permit the ending of our occupation, have met with gratifying success. Elections have been had to establish a provisional Dominican government,

government, and it is expected that the plan for a permanent government will soon be carried into effect.

In short, during the last three years, we have been able to convince the governments and the peoples of the American Continent, not only by our declarations but by outstanding example that ours is a government respectful of their rights, as well as regardful of our own, and that we are always willing to join with them in the furtherance of those larger purposes of international right and fair dealing upon which, in the last analysis, the peace and progress of the entire continent must depend.

In addition to the special conventions concluded at the recent Pan American Conference at Santiago, a treaty was signed to prevent conflicts between the American States. This treaty, signed by the representatives of sixteen American States, provides for the submission of all controversies which may arise between two or more of the contracting Powers and which it has been impossible to settle through diplomatic channels, or to submit to arbitration in accordance with existing treaties, shall be submitted for investigation and report to the Commission of Inquiry. Contracting parties undertake not to begin mobilization or to engage in any hostile acts or preparation for hostilities until the Commission has rendered its support. Any one of the governments directly interested in the investigation of the facts giving rise to the controversy may apply for the convocation of the Commission. The representatives of the American Republics have thus sought in an entirely practicable way by a general agreement to assure the maintenance of peace in this hemisphere. To this important treaty the Senate of the United States has given its prompt approval.

The determinative principles of our foreign policy are those of independence and cooperation. Independence -- that does not mean and never has meant isolation. Cooperation -- that does not mean and never has meant alliances or political entanglements. If
there

there are those among us who wish to involve this country in the political controversies of Europe, who desire our part in the Great War, in defense of our own security and of the cause of liberty itself, to be made the occasion or the basis of participation in the intrigues and rivalries of European politics, if there are those among us who think that that sort of participation is the only means of cooperation in the interest of peace and humanitarian ends, they are, I am sure, in a hopeless minority. If there are those who think, that with our vast resources, our increasing relative power, our varied contacts and complex intimacies, cultural and commercial, we can withdraw into ourselves, and that deaf alike to the appeals of interest and the calls of humanity we can lead an isolated national life, they are the victims of an unfortunate delusion. There is the just middle course of national safety, of national honor, of national interest, of national duty. It is the course of an appropriate cooperation, congenial to our traditions and institutions.

The only room for debate is as to the means of that cooperation. In seeking the wise and available course, it is a serious mistake to sacrifice substance for form, to make everything turn on the question of formal organization and our relation to it. The question of formal organization has been fully discussed and it would serve no useful purpose to reopen the controversy. The provisions of the Covenant of the League, to which there was decisive objection here, remain unaltered. The participation in political questions abroad, to which we were invited, is still opposed by preponderant sentiment. It would be idle to project a bitter and paralyzing dispute over forms of association when the substantial objects of a suitable cooperation can be otherwise achieved.

The real question is as to the subjects in relation to which we should, and we can, effectively cooperate. It is frequently
overlooked

overlooked that, even if we had a representative at Geneva, he would not speak when our Government desired him to be silent. His presence there would not permit him to participate in discussions or action when our Government did not wish such participation. What our Government would desire in each case would depend upon the subject matter, our traditional attitude, and our conception of national interest. It would depend upon sentiment here, not upon sentiment abroad. Moreover, if the Congress undertook to authorize such a representation, the Congress itself most probably would reserve the authority to give instructions and you can well imagine what the debate would be and what the instructions would be in cases where European political questions were involved and matters foreign to our interests were concerned.

The truth is that we cooperate now, where the subject matter is such that we would be able to cooperate at all. Indeed, we cooperate with a facility and elasticity which might be impaired or lost in the event of association in a formal organization, if this led to restrictions imposed through a fear of the possible abuses of opportunity which such an association would afford.

It may be observed that there is nothing obscure or reprehensible, nothing derogatory to our influence, dignity or prestige, in the form of our cooperation. It is simply adjusted to an inescapable fact. Of course, as the United States has decided not to become a member of the League of Nations, this Government cannot act as though it were a member. This Government cannot appoint its representatives as members of the League's Council, Assembly or committees. And this fact is properly recognized when we appoint so-called "observers" or unofficial representatives, who have appropriate contact with such committees in matters affecting our interests or the humanitarian concerns which appeal to us. They are unofficial simply in the sense that they are and cannot properly become members of the League organization or committees. But, so far as our Government is concerned, they

they represent it just as completely as those designated by the President always have represented our Government in the conferences and negotiations which he properly authorizes in the conduct of our foreign relations. Of course, such representatives cannot enter into any agreements with other Governments until they are approved in accordance with the requirements of our Constitution. There is nothing new in that.

There is no more difficulty in dealing with the organization of the League in this way for the purpose of protecting our interests or furthering our policies than there would be in dealing with the British Empire. Because several nations have formed an organization of which we are not a part is no reason why we cannot cooperate in all matters affecting our proper concern. We simply adjust our forms of contact and negotiation to the existing conditions.

The matter of real importance is with respect to the subjects we take up. We do not take up subjects which involve political entanglements. We do not take up subjects which would draw us into matters not approved by American sentiment. When we do take up a subject, it is because this Government desires it to be taken up and the same would be true under any form of action.

For example, the United States is a party to the Hague Convention of 1912 directed to the control of production and distribution of opium and derivative drugs. This is a matter in which we are deeply interested and in which we have had the privilege of leadership. Under the Covenant of the League of Nations, it was sought to transfer the administration of that Convention to the League. Measures to carry out more adequately the purposes of the treaty were needed. It was important that we should take the matter up most actively and this we did by dealing with the League committee. This Government did not
appoint

appoint members of that committee but it appointed its own representatives to present its views and to urge the reforms which were deemed to be imperative. Mr. Porter, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives headed this representation and made a determined fight for the proposals of this Government to put an end to the excessive production of opium and the evils of the distribution and consumption of narcotic drugs. Similarly, we have had the representatives of this Government in collaboration with the committees of the League in relation to Anthrax, Public Health, Anti-toxic Serums, Traffic in Women and Children, Relief Work, and the Control of the Traffic in Arms. When an invitation to a conference is not accepted by this Government, or when we take part only under prescribed limitations, it is simply because the competent authorities of this Government, who are concerned with the particular matter, do not think it advisable either to take part at all or to have a broader participation by reason of the particular circumstances or objects of that conference. When we do not approve a convention arrived at by the other Powers, it is simply because its terms are not congenial to the policies of this Government or the requirements of our Constitution. In short, we have, as we have always had, our full competence in obtaining information and in negotiating agreements. The President designates representatives for that purpose. Our record as a government in the cooperation we have maintained during the past three years in matters not involving political entanglements or injurious commitments, is one which should afford gratification to all our people irrespective of party. This substantial cooperation, in giving effect to our dominant national desire to be helpful in all matters engaging our interests and our humanitarian purposes, we propose to continue.

The

The United States is recognized throughout the world as possessing and exercising an influence second to none in promoting international peace. We favor international conferences whenever there is a reasonable prospect of forwarding in this manner conciliatory measures or of reaching useful agreements. We have always advocated the judicial settlement of international disputes, and to this end both President Harding and President Coolidge recommended, upon appropriate conditions, the support of the Permanent Court of International Justice. In the meantime, we are promoting the use of the processes of arbitration.

Our activity in the field of international accord is shown by the fact that in the past three years we have signed fifty treaties and international agreements, exclusive of postal conventions. Five of these required no action by the Senate. Of the remaining number, forty have been submitted to the Senate and of these thirty-seven have already received the Senate's approval. These agreements embrace treaties of peace, the Washington Conference treaties, the Santiago Conference treaties, claims conventions, treaties protecting the United States from discriminatory measures in mandated territories, reinforcing the policy of the "Open Door", extensions of arbitration conventions, treaties to facilitate trade and commerce and extradition treaties. There is also that unique and most important treaty with Great Britain to facilitate search and seizure, so that we may stop rum-running off our coasts. Similar treaties with other Governments are in course of negotiation.

Even more important than formal governmental relations is the cooperation between peoples. The contribution of the American people throughout the world in relief, in investment, in the substantial aid proffered by American experience and disinterestedness is a source of the deepest satisfaction. No appeal of the starving and distressed is made in vain to the

American

American heart. The suffering in every land are voicing gratitude for American benevolence. Aid to self-help is even better than charity and great productive enterprises in every part of the world find support in American capital. Billions of American money have been put into investments abroad to aid economic recovery. Whoever says that America stands aloof and withholds her support from a stricken world is guilty of reckless slander. We do stand aloof from political entanglements, but not otherwise. American aid, American advice, American impartiality in dealing with difficult problems, are sought and given. This most valuable contribution is aided rather than hindered by the fact that it is not governmental. Our government is one of restraints wisely imposed to place checks upon official discretion and to protect the different departments of government from encroachment upon each other. Governmental action generally requires the coordinated effort of different branches of government. It must issue from the fields of political controversy and is subject to the conflicts of opposing groups. It generally involves the rigidity of statutory enactments. Private action may be more direct, more flexible.

There has just been dramatic illustration of this. American brains, American experience, American competency of the highest order have been given to the solution of the most urgent European problems. A practicable adjustment of the questions pertaining to reparations is the essential foundation of the economic recovery for which the world is waiting. Central Europe has been in an economic chaos and has suffered the resulting evils of mistrust, of industrial distress. Nor has the injury due to the inability to find a settlement been limited to Europe. Our farmers have suffered through the decreased consuming power and the lack of markets. With a sound basis for economic recuperation abroad there will be new hope

hope and the promise of the dawn of a new era of general prosperity and peace. Had this Government attempted to make this contribution we should still be in controversy, and be held, as Europe has been held, in the grip of politics and racial antagonisms. The world needed the unfettered service of men of affairs to deal with the vital problems of industry and finance upon their merits. It is nonetheless an American contribution because it has been made by such men in the only practicable way.

We pause to pay our tribute of esteem to the beloved leader who has been taken from us, the man of warm heart, of generous purpose, of patriotic devotion. I have spoken of the achievements of his Administration. No one can adequately voice the deep affection in which we hold the memory of President Harding. In his loyal service he gave life itself.

We turn to the future. When President Harding was taken from us another was ready for the task. You will search in vain for a more ideal Executive than President Coolidge. The American people have already indicated their determination to keep him where he is. Whether you consider background, temperament, ability, equipment and experience, or conception of public duty, fidelity to obligation and personal integrity, he satisfies the public need. Upon the farm, among the hills of Vermont, was nourished a life which knows the frugality, the industry, the treasuring of every opportunity for self-help, the pursuit of knowledge despite all difficulties, the fine aspirations and patriotic ideals of what we take delight in regarding as the typical American home. The old tree is still bearing the finest fruit.

President Coolidge is his own platform. His first message was a comprehensive survey of conditions, requirements and purposes, which has charted the course of the Republican Party and commanded the approval of the country. No other platform is needed. The program of President Coolidge is that of national economy, of

retrenchment

retrenchment in expenditures, and reduction of taxation. It is that of the unsparing enforcement of the law with no immunities, no partiality, no sacrifice of public interest either to favor or to clamor. In his serenity and determination he embodies the spirit of justice. In foreign affairs his policy is that of national independence, of cooperation, faithful to our traditions, conserving American rights and cherishing every opportunity to assure peace and to aid the cause of humanity. In domestic affairs, his program touches with intelligent appreciation every department of public activity. He would foster agriculture and protect industry. He would make more efficient the established highways of commerce and he would open new highways by the improvement and construction of new waterways from the Great Lakes to the Gulf and by the great power and navigation project of the St. Lawrence River, to the benefit of the great Middle West and without impairment of the opportunities of the East. He would provide adequate care of our veterans, protect the public health, and make better provision for educational interests. He would promote American prosperity by holding abuses in check and at the same time assuring stability and the just confidence of enterprise without which the opportunities of progress wither and remedial legislation becomes but empty words.

No one can foresee the exigency which an Administration may have to confront. It is the unexpected that happens to Presidents as to others. For this reason, character is more important than declarations. Today, there is no occasion for experiment, no reason for uncertainty. The best assurance of the future is the character of Calvin Coolidge.

THE END.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

FOR THE PRESS.

FEBRUARY 11, 1925.

CONFIDENTIAL RELEASE FOR PUBLICATION UPON DELIVERY, AND
NOT TO BE PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED, QUOTED
FROM, OR USED IN ANY WAY.

- - -

SPEECH OF CHARLES E. HUGHES, SECRETARY OF STATE,
AT THE LINCOLN DAY DINNER UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
THE NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CLUB OF NEW YORK ON THE
EVENING OF FEBRUARY 12, 1925, 7 O'CLOCK, AT THE
WALDORF ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY.

- - -

Mr. Hughes said:

We honor the memory of Lincoln for his inestimable service in saving the Union at once undivided and with a new birth of freedom, for the beacon light of his humanity. He was so abundantly representative that he stands alone. He is our ideal and our test. The test is not one of achievement but of quality.

Washington not only gave us a country but he endowed it. We do not have to fight over again the battles of the Revolution, but we are ever on the battle field where we need his poise, his dignity, his self-sacrifice, his incorruptibility, his genius for leadership. Lincoln not only saved the Union, but he incarnated the spirit which alone can preserve the Union. The value of this anniversary is that it brings us to the true measurement of our attainments. How many of different sorts prophesy in his name and in his name seek to cast out devils and to do many mighty works! Lincoln's words, like those of

scripture, are brought to the support of diverse faiths. But how few who inscribe his name upon their banners emulate his patience, his love of the tests of reason, his magnanimity? How few in their passionate appeals display the balance of judgment which was made possible by his acumen, his sympathy, his clarity and humor? Peoples striving to be free, and to maintain freedom, have had their soldiers, their martyrs, their enthusiasts, their dictators, but there is but one Lincoln. For he represents at once the brain and the heart of democracy.

Since Lincoln's day, we have tripled our population and multiplied our national wealth many times. How shall we conserve our advantages? What Lincoln said in his young manhood, eighty-eight years ago, is still true, - "At what point is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, If it ever reach us it must spring up amongst us; it cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men we must live through all time, or die by suicide".

If we save ourselves, it will be because we exhibit organization and organic life. It will be because we know how to maintain essential institutions and to safeguard them equally against attack and decay. We cannot afford to overestimate our immunity and to look with unconcern upon those among us who would destroy our form of government. We cannot ignore their organized efforts to poison the mind of our youth and lead them in their inexperience to menace their own future. What do these disturbers of our peace desire? Is it security? Where else would they find the security they enjoy here? Wherever throughout the world their ideas tend to prevail, there in like proportion life itself is insecure except as it is lived in subservience to tyranny. True, we need to reinforce the instrumentalities of our security. We need

better administration of justice, an improved procedure in our criminal courts, a keener sense of the necessity of obedience to law and of the enforcement of the law as the expression of the democratic will. But, surely, no one could hope for security in disintegration. Is liberty desired? But this is the land to which the oppressed of other lands would flee. We have freedom of speech and freedom of assembly to the limit of tolerance consistent with organized society. We have liberty to go about without restraint and without espionage, the liberty of an uncensored press; the liberty of worship according to one's conscience; the liberty of institutions of education opening to all the avenues of knowledge. It is true that we have restraints that many do not like, but they are imposed by a sentiment freely expressed and written into law by constitutional methods. Neither in their genesis nor purpose, do they belong to the same class as the manifold impositions of despots seeking to intrench themselves in power. Is opportunity sought? It lies on every hand. After every allowance is made for abuses and for the regrettable conditions which every lover of mankind must desire to remedy, it still remains true that nowhere is labor better circumstanced or rewarded, nowhere is there such a high standard of living or so many comforts enjoyed by almost the entire population. It still remains true that we have on every hand groups studying conditions, diffusing knowledge, creating a better social hygiene. The only serious threat to labor in this country is the threat of political instability and of the impoverishment which would come from the destruction of the confidence which is the vital breath of enterprise. Is it justice that is desired? Who shall dispense it? Shall it be the mockery of justice which resides in the caprices of officials? Or shall it be the judgment of those who seek with the utmost

impartiality of which the human mind is capable to apply accepted principles embodied in a system of law subject to modification and improvement by the representatives of the people. We are not unmindful of the infirmities of administration, but we propose to preserve our house while we better its furnishings. We do not propose to permit our house to be torn down by those who object to houses.

In the midst of our efforts to make further progress let us express gratitude for what has already been accomplished. When I was a boy in this city, you could see on election day on many a street corner votes openly bought and purchased voters marshalled to the ballot box. That sort of thing could not happen now and is almost forgotten. Today, I am glad to say the purity of the ballot box in this community is about as well assured as it can be in a great municipality. Whatever the difficulties may be in our politics, they are due less than ever either to political despotism or to corruption. If we consider the nation as a whole what could be more encouraging than to witness the overwhelming defeat at the last election of the forces of discontent and to find the people with such general acclaim placing at the head of the government a man of the oldfashioned virtues, of the sincerity, the integrity and the common sense of Calvin Coolidge.

We are witnessing throughout the world the increasing difficulty of maintaining efficient representative government. The formation of numerous parties, the difficulty of maintaining coalitions and the disgust with the limited accomplishments of weak administrations especially menace parliamentary government. The difficulty with democracy is not one of theory but of making it work. Pure

democracy is impossible with vast populations and if representative government proves inefficient beyond toleration you have the alternative of dictatorship. If we are especially fortunate, it is because we have so distributed the powers of government as to lessen the danger of a total loss. Our institutions have the logic of practicality. Let us not demand blind worship but rather promote understanding. We have the most complicated arrangements of government on earth and they need constant attention. We have States because there were first Colonies and then States with their own traditions, their separate interests and their consequent jealousies. We now find ourselves with political divisions that seem to be in many respects artificial, but are unchangeable because firmly established in sentiment and practice and they afford the inestimable advantage of decentralized authority. If we did not have States our situation would be precarious indeed. We could not contemplate with composure any greater burden upon the bent shoulders of our representatives in Congress. The first lesson in civics is that efficient government should begin at home. If the citizens of New York City have not sufficient civic interest and organizing ability to meet adequately their own obvious needs, it is with poor grace that they criticise lost motion in Washington. The trouble is not with our system, but in applying the power that is going to waste. In the recent campaign, the attention of our people was focused on our institutions, especially on our judicial institutions. We have nothing better than our Supreme Court and our people intend to protect it against the attacks of demagogues. It does not need, as some think, to be popularized. The people understand, perhaps as never

before, that it does not exist for its own sake, or as a repository of arbitrary power, but as the best method devisable of bringing honest and impartial judgment, informed by sound learning, to the maintenance of the balances of our constitutional system and of the constitutional guaranties of individual rights. Our people realize that we have a most precious heritage of constitutional government, which gives play to individual energy while at the same time affording a sense of social security and a reasonable balance of competing interests. We should treasure the gains of the past for we have the most to lose and a debacle here would be the greatest loss the world could suffer.

Lincoln said in the speech from which I have already quoted that we must supply the pillars of liberty "hewn from the solid quarry of sober reason". The test of our safety, the measure of our capacity for progress, is not in resources of mine or farm or forest, not in our skill in agriculture, industry or the arts, but in our temper, in the reasonableness which enables us to work together and to get results. I am happy to think that this quality is more in evidence than formerly. It is more conspicuous in the press. I do not wish to charge our friends of the press with an undue reticence or an excessive sobriety of statement, but the rancor of an earlier day has largely disappeared. Many of our leading journals, not only in the impartiality of their news but in editorial comment, manifest the desire to be fair to opponents and to give the truth its chance to be mighty and prevail. The exceptions stand out with an unpleasant individuality. But the best evidence of the growth in the grace of reasonableness is shown by the futility of the extravagances of vituperative politics. These assaults are still

numerous on the platform and in the press, to say nothing of more privileged places. But while they attract much attention they do little damage because our people are increasingly disgusted with that sort of thing. At the last election, they voted on that proposition.

Reasonableness in dealing with public affairs implies a demand for the facts and also the sustained attention that is necessary to a sound judgment. The former we have, but the latter is difficult. Impressions are faint because so numerous. Even in the newspaper world, what is three months old is new. Unintelligent discussion thrives on poor memories and the overabundance of things to be read and heard. If you watch carefully, you will observe that those who wish to make the worse appear the better reason lie low while the facts are being set forth, and then later, after you think the public are fully informed, they spring forward with their mischievous statements and half-truths counting upon the forgetfulness of a busy people. Perhaps there was never anything more publicly and thoroughly discussed, for example, than the naval proposals at the Washington Conference. They were made at the very outset, stating definitely what ships were to be scrapped, what ships retained, the commensurate sacrifices asked of each great naval Power and the principles to be applied in the proposed agreement for limiting naval armament. These proposals went throughout the world. They were discussed for three months. Then a treaty was concluded and stated to the world; the naval provisions, the replacement schedules and the technical details worked out by naval experts were publicly set forth. The President sent the treaty to the Senate with a full report of the American delegation. The treaty was debated and approved by a vote of seventy-four to one, and of those who did not vote there were twenty stated upon

the record to be in its favor. You would suppose that to be publicity enough. And yet we have been treated for months to articles, speeches and editorials which ignored the facts disclosed and could have proceeded only upon the assumption that the people had forgotten them.

The problem is not so much to inform the public as to make the information stick. This is our greatest difficulty in an age of fleeting observations. How shall we make education thorough with so many enticements and diversions? How shall we secure a calm and deliberate judgment instead of having merely a generous disposition to be all things to all men and an openmindedness with the retentive capacity of a sieve. But after all many things do stick. The details may be forgotten but the essential truth may still leave a lasting impression and have a permanent influence. We need the constant emphasis on study, serenity and reasonableness as the essential qualifications for successful democracy.

It is this quality which will best fit us for international cooperation. It is a profound saying of Judge John Basset Moore "that international wars will cease when civil wars end. Within the State there is legal organization and sanction beyond anything yet proposed in the international sphere, while the very phrase 'civil' implies that the war is outlawed". The disposition which promises an end of international strife must first manifest itself in promoting domestic tranquility. If we have a mission, it can be prospered only in the spirit of reasonableness. We are constantly seeking to promote peace in this hemisphere, but this can be done only as we convince the people of our sister republics that we respect them, that we do not threaten their independence, and that we are ready with wise, friendly and impartial

counsel. We are solicitous throughout the world to avoid commitments and entanglements so that whatever contingencies arise we may be free, not to exercise an arbitrary choice, but to follow the dictates of reason and conscience, to take the action approved by an enlightened people. This freedom and our detachment from age-long racial and national conflicts makes our influence the greater. But we can never be just to ourselves and refuse the cooperation in the interest of peace and mutual helpfulness which is made possible by our independence and does not forfeit it. We are now at peace with the world and the opportunities of friendship are open on every hand. If the turbulent spirits among us whose aim seems to be to foment illwill, to turn friends into enemies, to erect between well-disposed peoples the barriers of lying imputations of motive and action, could only be quieted; if those who are loudest in vaunting their patriotism would do less harm to their country; if some of our advisers would be as astute in finding ways out of trouble as they are in getting us into trouble; if we could sound the note, not of an ignoble pacificism or of a truculent chauvinism, but of a noble reasonableness, we should be thrice armed and be secure in a just influence to which no one could set bounds.

Let me conclude with the words of Lincoln: "We find ourselves", said he, "under the government of a system of political institutions conducing more essentially to the ends of civil and religious liberty than any of which the history of former time tells us." It was the task of our ancestors, and nobly they performed it, "to possess themselves, and through themselves us, of this goodly land, and to uprear upon its hills and valleys a political edifice of liberty and equal rights; 'tis

ours only to transmit these - the former unprofaned by the foot of an invader, the latter undecayed by the lapse of time and untorn by usurpation - to the latest generation that fate shall permit the world to know. This task, gratitude to our fathers, justice to ourselves, duty to posterity, and love for our species in general, all imperatively require us faithfully to perform."

FINIS.



HUGHES, CHARLES E.

MANUSCRIPTS

SPEECHES

21
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900